

Multiple Intelligences Instrument Development

by Mery Berlian

Submission date: 02-Dec-2020 09:30AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1462019418

File name: Draft_Akhir_Multiple_Intelligences_Instrument_Development.docx (277.81K)

Word count: 4781

Character count: 29165

Multiple Intelligences Instrument Development: Identification System of Multiple Intelligences Tutor

Anonymous

Abstract

Research instruments are an important factor in a study in which the truth of researched results lies that determines the conclusion. Instruments are used to collect data and measure the object of a research variable. Present study aimed to retest a valid, consistent and reliable instrument related to multiple intelligences previously developed by McClellan & Conti. In this study, Multiple intelligences adapted from American psychologist, Howard Gardner, consisted of nine constructs, namely: 1) physical/kinesthetic, 2) existential/spiritual, 3) interpersonal, 4) intrapersonal, 5) logical thinking, 6) musical/rhythmic, 7) naturalistic, 8) verbal, and 9) visual. Designed as a survey study, it involved 140 respondents from primary education tutors of open university at pekanbaru selected using simple random sampling techniques. The data was analyzed using SPSS version 23.00 for Windows. The results showed that all questionnaire items were valid and reliable with a high average Cronbach Alpha reliability value ($0.763 > 0.6$) and every statement item has a high value ($0.786 - 0.887$) with total construct value 0.859. This study provides an alternative assessment related to multiple intelligence. Knowing the multiple intelligences of each tutor will make the tutor focus more on the superiority of his intelligence. This will have good consequences for the development of the student learning process.

Keywords: *Open university, Multiple Intelligences, Tutor, Mapping*

Introduction

In the 21st century, competition and challenges in all life aspects have become fiercer than ever. This century demands the mastery of various knowledge and skills, thus, urging educational institutions to improve in order to prepare individuals to face the real world. In principle, humans are equipped with various types of intelligence which go hand in hand with their potentials. However, in Indonesia, intelligences are still regarded as a single intelligence, that is, one is considered intelligent when they excel in academics (Vebrianto et al., 2020). Many students are disappointed or discontent with how their teachers teach at schools (Gardner, 1983). Teachers tend to be monotonous in their way of teaching. Rather than adjusting to their student's diverse and distinct intelligences, they adjust to their own intelligence (Fikriyah & Aziz, 2018). Implementation of intelligence is still not taken seriously and still tends to ignore the fundamentals of multiple intelligences themselves.

Study results show that one of common problems faced by students are discrepancy between students' learning style and educators' teaching style (Patimah et al., 2019). Teachers are having difficulties in electing an appropriate strategy (Sadiqin et al., 2017). Prospective teachers are also having the same problem when it comes to lecture, especially freshmen adjusting to new environment, from high school to college. Some students find it challenging to follow the materials delivered by the teachers. In this case, open university has not yet carried out a mapping or strived for an improvement to teaching methods for Tutors.

Reflecting on those conditions, tutors are expected to facilitate a learning process that embraces all kinds of students' intelligence and to implement integrated learning to make it more meaningful and easier to understand. This is because the tutor will prepare the best learning process according to the multiple intelligences he has. Elaborates that the essence of multiple intelligences according to Gardner is recognizing the uniqueness of each

individual and their way of learning, developing models to assess them, and infinite ways to realize themselves in this world (Nadejda & Nina, 2020). During learning process, a tutor should be conscientious and take into account many things including learning approaches being used. Tutors must identify and understand different intelligences. Activities designed by teacher must foster the development of multiple intelligences, integrating individual differences in the process (Adilla et al., 2019). In addition, some students may display all intelligences in themselves and some only display one kind of intelligence (Yavich & Rotnitsky, 2020). According to Chatib, in its implementation, MI-based learning strategies should contain the following supporting elements: 1) learning strategies should be related to syllabus, especially indicators of learning outcomes; 2) learning strategies should adopt student-based approach; 3) method selection should be adjusted in accordance with students' learning style; and 4) learning strategies should be accompanied with authentic assessment rubrics (Suniyah et al., 2018). Other research also shows that the implementation of multiple intelligences learning can be considered successful if the types of learning instruments (syllabus, lesson plans, learning materials, and learning evaluations) are available and there is a desire from the teacher to learn the theory and the way of delivering the material using MI theory (Asad et al., 2020). This is supported by a study showing that assessment instruments can be beneficial in many ways, including in academic achievement (Damaianti et al., 2020).

Another corroboration comes from a study showing that the implementation of multiple intelligences strategy in the class can optimize students' learning skills (Derakhshan & Faribi, 2015). They claim that multiple intelligence strategy should be applied in classes in order to boost up the students' learning skills. Therefore, tutors are expected to come up with ways to deal with problems arising from the implementation

of MI-based learning strategy. Moreover, a tutor is also urged to be able to organize class management, establish good interaction, communication, and relationship with their students (Adedigb & Sulaiman, 2020). Have done make to Identifying the multiple intelligences of your students.

Several studies have shown that: 1) lecturers' pedagogical competence, intellectual intelligence and self-efficacy simultaneously influence student learning motivation (Lumbantobing, 2020); 2) lecturers have adequate behavior and abilities so that they can develop students' abilities completely (Haerazi et al., 2020); and 3) lecturers regularly update their skills and knowledge to maintain effective teaching activities in the context of professional development (Orakci, 2020).

Multiple intelligence theory (MI) is a relatively new theory formulated by Howard Gardner. Gardner defines intelligence as an ability to solve problems and produce a product in certain settings and in real circumstances (Kelelufna & Masan, 2019). Intelligence is not one's ability to answer test questions in a closed room detached from their environment. Rather, intelligence represents one's ability to solve real problems in various situations (Chotib, 2018). A person is intelligent when they can solve real life problems, not just in theory. The abler and more ingenious someone in solving various complex problems, the more intelligent they are.

Intelligence is one of several main factors that determines the success of failure of students. Students with a low or subnormal intelligence level are more likely to have low motivation. However, having high intelligence is not an absolute analogy to academic success. According to Yasmine, the theory of multiple intelligences is the highest validation of the notion that individual differences are noteworthy. Its implementation in education is highly dependent on identification, recognition and appreciation toward each and every student's way of learning, in addition to individual student interests. The theory of multiple

intelligences does not only recognize these individual differences for practical purposes, such as teaching and assessment, but also consider and accept them as something normal, natural, even interesting and priceless (Sukitman, 2016).

In essence, each individual has a number of intelligences, including language/linguistic, logical-mathematical, visual spatial, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, musical, and naturalist intelligence (Rofiah, 2016). The theory is based on the reasoning that using IQ test to measure intellectual aptitude is very limiting, since IQ test emphasizes only on logical capability (mathematics) and language (Kurniawan, 2015). In fact, everyone has their own unique way to solve the problems they face. By implementing multiple intelligences, teaching activities are likened to water that fills spaces for students. By considering and looking closely at the most suitable way of learning from each individual, an educator/parent is expected to be able to act wisely and prudently in choosing a teaching style that suits a student's learning style.

When carefully observed, the theory of multiple intelligences is actually a representation of functions of two hemispheres of the human brain, namely right hemisphere and left hemisphere. The brain hemisphere has the ability and potential to solve mathematical, logical and phenomenal problems. While the right brain hemisphere has the ability to respond to things that are qualitative, artistic and abstract, though it should be noted that all this is still within the framework of the outside world capability, not including the knowledge and understanding of oneself (Sukmaangara & Prabawati, 2019). Suharsono said that Gardner's findings on multiple intelligences are widely adapted by various parties because of their function as early detection of gifted and artistic talents. It is not less that the theory quantum learning which also makes reference to this intelligence pattern. Likewise, owing to Gardner's theory, various fields can filter and

welcome gifted individuals who in the future are expected to make a significant contribution to human excellence and motivation (Chaerunnisa et al., 2017).

Multiple intelligence-based learning, in general, can be defined as a learning process that offers "wiggling room" to every individual student to expand upon their intelligence potentials. Students are encouraged to be able to learn comfortably, without feeling compelled, and have high motivation. In essence, multiple intelligence-based learning can also be defined as a method that constantly encourage students to be creative. Indeed, the creativity refers to a form of creativity that can support the sustainability of the learning process by producing a proud academic motivation target (Sari et al., 2018).

Thus, in this study, the researcher establishes 9 construct of multiple intelligences for primary education tutors of open university, namely: 1) physical/kinesthetic, 2) existential/spiritual, 3) interpersonal, 4) intrapersonal, 5) logical thinking, 6) musical/rhythmic, 7) naturalistic, 8) verbal, and 9) visual.

Present study aimed to retest a valid, consistent and reliable instrument related to multiple intelligences previously developed by McClellan & Conti. Because research instruments are an important factor in a study in which the truth of researched results lies that determines the conclusion.

Method

Designed as a Educational Design Research, that a systematic study of developing educational interventions (such as programs, strategies and learning materials, products and systems) as a solution to solving problems complex in educational practice, that too aims to put forward our knowledge of these interventions as well the design and development process (Polmp, 2007). This study aimed to produce an instrument of tutor multiple intelligence. A questionnaire was used to collect data (Creswell, 2012). The questionnaire was developed with 9

scales, conforming with the 9 constructs of the theory of multiple intelligences, namely: 1) physical/kinesthetic, 2) existential/spiritual, 3) interpersonal, 4) intrapersonal, 5) logical thinking, 6) musical/rhythmic, 7) naturalistic, 8) verbal, and 9) visual (McClellan & Conti, 2008) whose validity and reliability levels would be assessed to create a quality and functional instrument. This was necessary to ensure the generalizability of the instrument in evaluating multiple intelligences since the study would be conducted in Asia, especially in Indonesia that has distinctive ethnic characters.

3 This study used probability sampling with simple random sampling, the researcher select respondent (or unit, such as open university tutors) for the sample so that any individual has an equal probability of being selected from population. So simple random sampling is to choose individuals to sampled who will be representative of population (Creswell, 2012).

This study involved 140 respondents consisting of tutors of primary education of open university at Pekanbaru from the total of 180 tutors used Krejcie and Morgan Formula. The researcher used stratified and random sampling to ensure that every population member has equal probability to be chosen as part of the sample. Once the data was collected through questionnaire distribution, it was then processed using SPSS version 23.00 for Windows to see the extent of the quality of the instrument being developed. Instrument validity was used which was obtained from corrected item total correlation with the number item-less scores follows the dimensions or constructs and from judge from expert, while the reliability index was obtained from the use of Cronbach Alpha.

Findings and Discussion

Table 1. instrument construct of multiple intelligences

Instrument Development

The development of the instrument of multiple intelligences for primary education tutors employed three stages of approach, namely: stage 1: starting with scale identification; stage 2, involving writing individual items on a scale; and stage 3, involving field testing items followed by item analysis and validation procedures (Creswell, 2012). The following would present a description of the steps undertaken by the researcher.

Stage 1 Scale Identification and Development

Stage 1 consisted of three steps leading to identification and scale development. The first step was to review the literature related to multiple intelligence instruments. The main source of elements in multiple intelligences was largely adapted from the theory of multiple intelligences which consisted of 9 constructs (McClellan & Conti, 2008) and other relevant materials. This important step was intended to identify main components to be considered by researchers, educators, and practitioners as multiple intelligences needed in this challenging era. The second step was to conduct a focused group discussion with a group of experienced lecturers to elicit recommendations regarding multiple intelligences to fix part of instrument. In addition, the researcher also sought for approval and validity of the constructs and item being developed in the instrument. The third step was to classify and reorganize the newly-developed scale regarding multiple intelligences as per experts' recommendations.

Stage 2 - Drawing Up Individual Items

Based on the instrument of multiple intelligences, the researcher developed a questionnaire where each component of multiple intelligences consisted of constructs to guide the recognition of multiple intelligences. Below were all multiple intelligences items presented to the expert panel to ensure construct validation and instrument content.

Construct	Item	Question Item
Physical/Kinesthetic	1	I have an active lifestyle
	10	I enjoy outdoor games
	18	I like working with tools
Existential/Spiritual	2	Meditation practice is beneficial
	11	Questions about life meaning are important for me
	19	I like discussing questions about life
Interpersonal	3	I am a "team player"
	12	I learn better by interacting with others
	20	I enjoy clubs and extracurricular activities
Intrapersonal	4	Fairness is important for me
	21	I learn better if I have emotional bond with the subject
Logical thinking/mathematics	5	Structures help me succeed
	13	Unorganized people frustrate me
	22	Step-by-step instructions are very helpful
Musical/rhythmic	6	I enjoy many kinds of music
	14	I have always been interested in musical instruments
	23	I memorize song lyrics easily
Naturalistic	7	My house has a recycling system
	15	Animals are important for me
	24	I enjoy hiking
Verbal/linguistic/ language	8	I keep a journal
	16	I write for fun
	25	I am interested in foreign languages
Visual/Spatial	9	I love doing three-dimensional puzzle
	17	I can remember things with images in my mind
	26	I can imagine ideas in my mind

Stage 3 – Validity and Reliability Analysis of the Instrument

One of important step in this study was the design of measurement instrument complete with validity and reliability test. The construct validity indicated the extent to which the measuring instrument expresses a theoretical construct that was to be measured and obtained by conducting trials (Setyawati et al., 2017). A number of methods can be utilized to measure construct validity, such as correlation assessment between research data and existing measurement method, convergent discriminant technique, factor analysis, and multi method analysis (Emory & Cooper, 1991); (Fahrana & Fahmi, 2017).

Instrument Validity Analysis

Table 2. Instrument Validity Using Item Correlation with Corrected Item-Total Correlation

Konstruk	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Physical/Kinesthetic	1	0.816	0.829
	10	0.845	0.81
	18	0.867	0.809
Existential/Spiritual	2	0.848	0.837
	11	0.920	0.810
	19	0.893	0.823
Interpersonal	3	0.831	0.834
	12	0.881	0.810
	20	0.855	0.811
Intrapersonal	4	0.822	0.887
	21	0.846	0.847
Logical thinking/mathematics	5	0.778	0.792
	13	0.650	0.802
	22	0.794	0.786

B As shown in Figure 2, the ethnicities included in this study as respondents consisted of Malay, Minang, Javanese, Batak + others. Respondents of Malay ethnicity numbered 56 (40%) respondents; Minang ethnicity numbered 38 (27%) respondents; Javanese ethnicity numbered 28 (20%) respondents and Batak + others numbered 18 (13%) respondents. Thus, it is clear that the majority of respondents came from Malay and Minang ethnicity.

In addition to respondent data based on gender and ethnicity, the researcher also conducted an analysis to determine instrument validity using corrected item-total correlation value. Below are the results of instrument validity test.

Konstruk	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Musical/rhythmic	6	0.881	0.812
	14	0.880	0.816
	23	0.828	0.832
Naturalistic	7	0.733	0.806
	15	0.767	0.803
	24	0.774	0.792
Verbal/linguistic/ language	8	0.761	0.823
	16	0.817	0.805
Visual/Spatial	25	0.844	0.802
	9	0.664	0.841
	17	0.866	0.791
	26	0.874	0.791

As seen in Table 2, we can see the value of corrected item total correlation above of 0.3 obtained with a degree of freedom (df) of 138 out of 27 questionnaires distributed. From overall calculation, all items were declared valid since r -count value $>$ r -table that all question items could be used to measure multiple intelligences of primary tutors of open university.

The analysis result using corrected item total correlation must have a minimum value of 0.3 (Nunnally, 1978). Validity coefficient value ranged from +1.00 to -1.00. coefficient value of +1.00 indicated that individuals in the instrument test or criteria test had relatively similar results while validity coefficient of 0 indicated that there was no correlation between the instruments and the criteria. The higher the validity

coefficient value of an instrument is, the better the instrument is (Yusup, 2018). Correlation between items with a score above 0.25 is considered as a high score and therefore can be used to measure constructs involved in a study (Nunnally, 1978).

Instrument Reliability Analysis

In the development of the instrument of multiple intelligences, each item was analyzed for internal consistency. This was a measurement of the extent to which items in the scale measured constructs identically with other items in the same scale. Below were the results of reliability analysis using Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the questionnaire based on the instrument of multiple intelligences of primary education tutors of open university.

Table 3. Cronbach Alpha Reliability Index for Each Construct

Construct (N = 140)	Overall Alpha Cronbach Value
Physical/Kinesthetic	0.860
Existential/Spiritual	0.869
Interpersonal	0.863
Intrapersonal	0.897
Logical thinking/Mathematics	0.832
Musical/Rhythmic	0.865
Naturalistic	0.841
Verbal/Linguistic/Language	0.853
Visual/Spatial	0.851
Total Construct	0.859

As seen in Table 3, overall alpha values for each constructs like physical/kinesthetic, existential/spiritual, interpersonal, intrapersonal, logical thinking, musical/rhythmic, naturalistic, verbal and visual constructs were 0.860; 0.869; 0.863; 0.897; 0.832; 0.865; 0.841; 0.853; and 0.851, respectively. In present study, it was known that the reliability values (α) with total construct 0.859 were greater than 0.60 for all constructs

studied (Joseph F. Hair et al., 2006) in order to produce an excellent and quality instrument.

Cronbach's Alpha is a general measure used to measure the reliability of a set of indicators of 2 or more variables (Fahrana & Fahmi, 2017). The reliability of this study's instrument was tested by looking at the composite block reliability indicator value measure construct and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Cronbach's Alpha values ranged from 0 and 1 where high alpha value showed

high reliability among the indicators t (Straub & Gefen, 2004). Composite reliability value is considered satisfactory if it is above 0.7 (Indrayani et al., 2017). In this study, An Alpha value for an instrument of tutor multiple intelligence higher or equals to 0.80 is accepted in most of implementations in social sciences. However, Morris stated that for behavioral research, researches in general can accept a Cronbach's Alpha greater than or equals to 0.60 (Mónus, 2020).

Therefore, it could be said that all constructs used in this study were declared reliable. This meant that this instrument could measure what it was supposed to measure and could be used to measure and evaluate the instrument of multiple intelligences of primary education tutors of open university.

From the questionnaire distributed online, it was known that the most dominant intelligence in primary tutors was intrapersonal intelligence (79.17%) and existential/spiritual intelligence (77.8%). As for the lowest intelligence, naturalistic intelligence came first (62.17%) followed by musical intelligence (67.14). There were a number of efforts that could be undertaken to improve students' ability in nurturing their multiple intelligences in learning process. One of them was that educators need to provide sufficient time for students to reflect and think (A. K. Sari, 2014).

Through the development of multiple intelligences, students could participate in the process of maximizing their ability to think, solve problems, and practice the role playing activities contained in learning activities. This was in line with a study showing that multiple intelligences could collaborate to bring about skills in students (Sanderson, 2016). In addition, for GLS to take place optimally, this must also involve collaboration between tutors and students. Furthermore, the teacher must be an example for students during GLS activities (Antoro, 2017). A tutor should be able to influence student morale by setting examples to earn their trust. Learning activities carried out continuously would be able to improve students' reading and writing abilities. We understood that writing ability would improve after engaging in writing lesson (Zulaeha, 2013). Leveraging multiple

intelligences in solving problems in class could support the achievement of the goals of the school literacy movement. Careful learning planning, selection of the right media, and the right learning steps would be of tremendous significance in providing positive support for the implications of the model being developed.

As shown by the results, the questionnaire of primary tutor multiple intelligence had value of corrected item total correlation above of 0.3 (valid constructs) and Cronbach Alpha result have a value above 0.6 and below 1 (high reliability). Therefore, the instrument of multiple intelligences was good to be employed in a research to identify multiple intelligences among tutors in the context of learning and teaching process.

A study further corroborated that a valid and reliable instrument could be used as a measuring instrument (Suratno et al., 2016). Furthermore, an assessment instrument should meet validity, reliability and feasibility requirements (Pinilih et al., 2013). The development the assessment instrument of multiple intelligences represented the implementation of education standardization policy contained in PP no. 19/2005, Article 63-72 of Kemendiknas No. 20 of 2007 on Educational Assessment Standards, stating that education assessment at the tertiary level is regulated by each tertiary institution in accordance with applicable laws and regulations (Astuti et al., 2015).

This research given alternative an instrument of tutor multiple intelligence with instrument could measure what it was supposed to measure and evaluate the instrument of multiple intelligences of primary education tutors of open university.

This policy demanded tutors to be able to produce several instruments of multiple intelligence assessment in order to realize ideal teaching and learning process in accordance with set competencies.

Conclusion

The instrument of multiple intelligences developed in this study is feasible theoretically to be used to measure the intelligences of primary education tutors of open university. The researcher have done to produce an

excellent and quality instrument. In addition, the assessment instrument also meets empirical feasibility criteria in validity and reliability tests. All question items in the questionnaire are valid and the reliability test shows that Cronbach's Alpha (α) count values are greater than Cronbach's Alpha (α) value, which is $0.763 > 0.60$. In present study, it was known that the total reliability value (α) of the instrument construct of 0.859 is used to measure what should be used to measure and evaluate the multiple intelligence instrument of open tertiary education tutors effectively.

References

- Adedigb, O., & Sulaiman, F. R. (2020). Influence of Teachers' Classroom Management Style on Pupils' Motivation for Learning and Academic Achievement in Kwara State. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 6(2), 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.6.2.471>
- Adilla, S., Zubainur, C. M., & Ahmad, A. (2019). Pembelajaran Matematika yang Berorientasi Multiple Intelligences pada Persamaan dan Pertidaksamaan Linier Satu Variabel. 7(1), 193–206. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jp.v7i1.13748>
- Asad, M. M., Hussain, N., Wadho, M., Khand, Z. H., & Churi, P. P. (2020). Integration of e-learning technologies for interactive teaching and learning process: an empirical study on higher education institutes of Pakistan. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2020-0103>
- Astuti, W. P., Wibawanto, H., & Khumaedi, M. (2015). Pengembangan Instrumen Penilaian Unjuk Kerja Praktik Perawatan Kulit Wajah Berbasis Kompetensi di Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 4(2), 8–14.
- Chaerunnisa, V., Syauqiyah, S. G., & Ekanara, B. (2017). Pengembangan Perangkat Pembelajaran Biologi Berorientasi Pengembangan Kecerdasan Majemuk Siswa Pada Konsep Sel Kelas XI SMA. *Biodidaktika*, 12(1), 30–37.
- Chotib, S. H. (2018). Kajian Konsep Multiple Intelligences terhadap Penerapan Pembelajaran di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Annaliyah: Jurnal PGMI*, 1(1), 60–75.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting And Evaluating Quantitative dan Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Damaianti, V. S., Abidin, Y., & Rahma, R. (2020). Higher order thinking skills-based reading literacy assessment instrument : An Indonesian context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 513–525.
- Derakhshan, A., & Faribi, M. (2015). Multiple Intelligences: Language Learning and Teaching. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n4p63>
- Emory, C. W., & Cooper, D. R. (1991). *Business Research Methods*. Richard D Irwin, Inc.
- Fahrana, Y., & Fahmi, M. (2017). Validitas dan Reliabilitas Konstruk Pengukuran Perpustakaan Ideal Berbasis Pemakai dengan Pendekatan LIBQUAL. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis Dan Kewirausahaan*, 6(2), 161. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jebik.v6i2.22989>
- Fikriyah, F. Z., & Aziz, J. A. (2018). Penerapan Konsep Multiple Intelligences pada Pembelajaran PAI. *IQ (Ilmu Al-Qur'an): Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 1(02), 220–244. <https://doi.org/10.37542/iq.v1i02.17>
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books.
- Haerazi, H., Irawan, L. A., Suadiyatno, T., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Triggering

- preservice teachers' writing skills through genre-based instructional model viewed from creativity. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(1), 234–244.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i1.203945>
- Joseph F. Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson Educational International.
- Kelelufna, V. P., & Masan, A. L. (2019). Meningkatkan Prestasi Belajar Siswa SMA Pada Materi Gelombang Bunyi Menggunakan Strategi Multiple Intelligences. *Jurnal Pedagogika Dan Dinamika Pendidikan*, 7(2), 127–136.
- Kurniawan, A. (2015). Pembelajaran dengan Kecerdasan Jamak di Sekolah. *Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI*, 3(2), 54–67.
<http://repositorio.unan.edu.ni/2986/1/5624.pdf>
- Lumbantobing, P. A. (2020). The Contribution of Lecturer Pedagogical Competence, Intellectual Intelligence and Self-Efficacy of Student Learning Motivation. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 3(1), 564–573.
<https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v3i1.852>
- McClellan, J. A., & Conti, G. J. (2008). Identifying the Multiple Intelligences of Your Students. *Journal of Adult Education*, 37(1), 13–32.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ891071&site=ehost-live>
- Mónus, F. (2020). Environmental perceptions and pro-environmental behavior—comparing different measuring approaches. *Environmental Education Research*, 0(0), 1–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1842332>
- Nadejda, B., & Nina, B. (2020). Evaluation in Higher Education: Evaluation of Spiritual Intelligence of the Academic Staff. *Assessment, Testing, and Measurement Strategies in Global Higher Education*, 24.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-2314-8.ch009>
- Nunnally, J. . (1978). *The Study of Change in Evaluation Research: Principal Concerning Measurement, Experimental Design and Analysis*. Sage Publication.
- Orakci, Ş. (2020). Postgraduate students' expectations of their lecturers. *Qualitative Report*, 25(1), 199–215.
- Patimah, S., Sholahuddin, A., & Sadiqin, I. K. (2019). Studi Kasus Identifikasi Gaya Belajar dan Multiple Intelligences Mahasiswa Baru Calon Guru Kimia. *Quantum: Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Sains*, 10(1), 76.
<https://doi.org/10.20527/quantum.v10i1.5945>
- Pinilih, F. W., Budiharti, R., & Ekawati, E. Y. (2013). Pengembangan Instrumen Penilaian Produk Pada Pembelajaran IPA Untuk Siswa SMP. *Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika*, 1(2).
<http://www.jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id/index.php/%0Apfisika/article/viewFile/2798/1914>
- Rofiah, N. H. (2016). Menerapkan Multiple Intelligences Dalam Pembelajaran di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Dinamika Pendidikan Dasar*, 8(1), 69–79.
<http://jurnalnasional.ump.ac.id/index.php/Dinamika/article/view/937/875>
- Sadiqin, I. K., Santoso, U. T., & Sholahuddin, A. (2017). Pemahaman konsep IPA Siswa SMP Melalui Pembelajaran Problem Solving Pada Topik Perubahan Benda-benda di Sekitar Kita. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan IPA*, 3(1), 56.
<http://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jipiJurnal>

- Sanderson, B. (2016). The Impact of the Multiple Intelligences on Literacy Learning: A Case Study. *Education and Human Development*.
- Sari, R., Massawet, E. T., & Masruhim, M. A. (2018). Perangkat Pembelajaran Kecerdasan Eksistensial dan Keterampilan Berpikir Kreatif Siswa dalam Pembelajaran Biologi. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, Dan Pengembangan*, 3(8), 1068–1075.
- Setyawati, R. D., Happy, N., & Murtianto, Y. H. (2017). Instrumen Angket Self-Esteem Mahasiswa ditinjau Dari Validitas dan Reliabilitas. *Jurnal Phenomenon*, 7(2), 174–186.
- Sukitman, T. (2016). Konsep Pembelajaran Multiple Intelligence Dalam Pendidikan IPS di Sekolah Dasar. *LIKHITAPRAJNA. Jurnal Ilmiah.Fakultas Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 18(1), 1–12. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/235023-konsep-pembelajaran-multiple-intelligenc-eb07746b.pdf>
- Sukmaangara, B., & Prabawati, M. N. (2019). Analisis Struktur Berpikir Peserta Didik Dalam Menyelesaikan Masalah Tes Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Matematik Berdasarkan Dominasi Otak. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Call For Papers*, 3, 89–95.
- Suniyah, S., Rohmadi, M., & Sulistiyo, E. T. (2018). Implementasi Strategi Pembelajaran Menulis Berbasis Multiple Intelligences. *Sekolah Dasar: Kajian Teori Dan Praktik Pendidikan*, 27(2), 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um009v27i22018p174>
- Vebrianto, R., Tuan Soh, T. M., Yusra, N., Zarkasih, Abu Bakar, A. Y., & Syafaren, A. (2020). Competency of Pre-Service Elementary School Teacher Based on Multiple Intelligences Theory in Riau Province. *Proceedings of the 1st Progress in Social Science, Humanities and Education Research Symposium (PSSHRS 2019)*, 464, 725–730. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200824.162>
- Yavich, R., & Rotnitsky, I. (2020). Multiple intelligences and success in school studies. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(6), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n6p107>

Multiple Intelligences Instrument Development

ORIGINALITY REPORT

7 %

SIMILARITY INDEX

7 %

INTERNET SOURCES

4 %

PUBLICATIONS

4 %

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

journal.uny.ac.id

Internet Source

2 %

2

Submitted to Walden University

Student Paper

1 %

3

Submitted to Mancosa

Student Paper

1 %

4

R Andika, I K Sari, Y Ningsih, Masniladevi, Y Helsa. "Assessment for learning of mathematics", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019

Publication

1 %

5

s3.amazonaws.com

Internet Source

1 %

6

www.lynnwebs.com

Internet Source

1 %

7

e-journal.unipma.ac.id

Internet Source

1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 1%